UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Science the Peace Maker?

By M. C. OTTO

"Headlong America"

Concluded

By THEODORE DEMAREST WALSER

Upon the Gentle Art of Being "Colored"

By EDGAR H. WEBSTER

VOLUME CIV NUMBER 22

Chicago, February 17, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. G. W. WESTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROGERS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown,
Fred Hankinson,
Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA— Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

Five Articles on Russia

by

Anna Louise Strong

Miss Strong has lived in Russia for a large part of every year since the Revolution in 1917. She has traveled in every part of the country, and has crossed Siberia and China. She knows all the leaders of the Soviet Republic and is in intimate touch with all political and social movements. These articles are written from Russia where she is now residing.

The subjects of this special series of articles are as follows:

The Fighting Farmers of Russia.
The Year of the Great "Breakover" in Russia.
Soviet Rulers on Vacation.
Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies.
Moving Out from the Ranks in Russia, or Raising Up Managers.

These five articles will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for February 24.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 339
Science the Peace Maker?—M. C. OTTO..... 341
Jottings—J. H. H..... 343

ARTICLES—

Obeying the Law—*Plato: Crito*..... 339
"Headlong America" (Concluded)—THEODORE DEMAREST WALSER 343
Upon the Gentle Art of Being "Colored"—EDGAR H. WEBSTER 345

POETRY—

Song for the Troubadour—A. M. SULLIVAN.. 344

THE STUDY TABLE—

Today and Tomorrow—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 349
The Good Life—FRANK S. HARWOOD..... 349

CORRESPONDENCE—

A Foreign Student Looks at Christianity—JAMES S. MORSE..... 350
Mr. Levinson's Second "Sanction"—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW 351
Prices, Wages and Unemployment—CHARLES P. KRAFT 351

THE FIELD—

Nine Neediest Cases—*The Arbitrator*..... 351
The Liquor Situation in Canada—*Zion's Herald* 352

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1930 NUMBER 22

OBEYING THE LAW

Socrates: If a man enters into an agreement right in itself, must he perform his part, or may he slink out by deceit?

Crito: He must do his part.

Socrates: Go a step further. If we escape hence (from prison) without the consent of the city, are we not doing an injury to those whom we ought least to wrong? And are we abiding by our just agreement?

Crito: I can't answer your question, Socrates; I don't quite understand.

Socrates: Look at it in this way. Suppose I am about to run away—or whatever you may call my escape—and the laws of the commonwealth should come to me and say: "Tell us, Socrates, what do you propose to do? Is it your purpose to destroy us, the laws, and the whole city so far as your influence can extend? Do you think it possible for a city to exist in which the laws do not stand valid, but are set aside and nullified by individual citizens? . . . We bestowed upon you life and nurture and education; we gave you and other citizens a share in all the good things we possess; still more we give authority to every Athenian, when he has come of age, and seen the laws and administration of the city, to take his property, if we do not please him, and depart whithersoever he wishes to any colony or foreign state. If after this any man remains . . . then we affirm that such a man has by his very act ratified an agreement with us to do whatever we command; and we affirm that he who disobeys us . . . breaks a solemn compact. We have given him his choice: either to follow our commands, which are indeed not severe, or to alter us by persuasion if we are wrong. Yet neither of these things will he do.

—Plato: Crito.

Gandhi is pushing the independence movement in India with a persistence as steady as it is prudent. Armed with full powers of resistance to the British *Raj,* the Mahatma withholds his hand, that the Empire may be given every opportunity to find the way of peace. Thus, in his most recent public utterance Gandhi announces that the campaign of civil disobedience, authorized by the Lahore Congress, may be avoided, but on conditions! These conditions, as listed by Gandhi in *Young India,* make a document of historic significance. They are as follows:

Total prohibition of liquor.

Reduction of the value of the rupee to 32 cents.

Reduction of land taxes by at least half, making them subject to legislative control.

Abolition of the tax on salt production.

Reduction of military expenditure by at least half.

Reduction in salaries of the higher grade civil service to one-half or even less, to suit reduced revenue.

A protective tariff on foreign cloth.

Passage of a coastal shipping reservation bill.

Discharge of all political prisoners except murderers or attempted murderers.

Withdrawal of all political prosecutions.

Abrogation to all Indian exiles to return.

Abolition of the Criminal Investigation Department or its control by popular methods.

Issuance of licenses to use firearms for self-defense, subject to popular control.

"If he (the Viceroy) satisfies these vital needs," says Gandhi, "the Indian National Congress will heartily participate in any conference where there is perfect freedom for expression and demands." Here the way is opened wide for the very round-table gathering that Ramsay MacDonald presumes to want. Yet it is the unanimous judgment of newspaper correspondents, so far as we have seen, that nothing will be done along these lines of reform. "There is little chance," says the Associated Press dispatch, "that the demands will be even considered, let alone granted." Thus does the crisis in India drift on to its inevitable upheaval. The Indians exploring every way of peace consistent with the ends they seek, the English silently and sullenly relying upon the armed force at their disposal! We still have hope, because we still have confidence in MacDonald and in Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, as well as in Gandhi, but we have to confess that this hope is growing thin.

There is a proverb that "everything has an end." This is now demonstrated anew in Spain, where General Rivera, after six years of arrogant dictatorial rule, has recently resigned his office to the King. This event tempts one to hope that we have here the beginning of the end of all the dictatorships of Europe. It may be so, but we should not be too sanguine. Rivera was essentially a weak man. He had nothing but bluster to commend him, and the power which a feeble king allowed without reason to slip from his own hands. That Rivera lasted for six years is testimony not to his ability, not to any works of political reorganization which he achieved, but to the essential indifference of the Spanish people to their own democratic interests, and the willingness of the King to tolerate anything which relieved him of responsibility and thus left him the freer to enjoy his pleasures. But other European dictators—Horthy and Mussolini, for example—are men of different stripe. The Italian king, of course, is the perfect specimen of monarchical futility. His spirit is even smaller than his stature. But Mussolini

rules primarily in his own right—because he is a man of dominant personality, as powerful in intellect as he is arrogant and brutish in character. We may like him or not, but the fact still remains that the Italian Caesar is one of the great men of his time. Horthy is less magnetic, and even more terrible, than Mussolini. He is the Metternich, as Mussolini is the Bonaparte, of his day. But he sits as firmly in his seat of power, and will in all probability be with us for some time to come. Yet even to these men and to their rule there must come at last an end. We can wait, as God waits, for the vindication of his law of liberty.

We have not been saying much lately in these columns about Austria. When the League of Nations was in charge of this bankrupt and desperate country after the war, and Geneva was tooting to the four corners of the earth the wondrous tale of the rehabilitation of Austria under the League's administration, we refused to believe, and said so repeatedly. After what the Versailles peacemakers did to this helpless nation, it was as evident to us as the nose on our face that no rehabilitation of Austria was possible. As well cut off a head from its trunk and expect it to keep on breathing and thinking, as to expect Vienna to survive its political severance from Bohemia and Hungary and the Tyrol! The League of Nations' talk about Austria was propaganda, as its actual work in Austria was "bunk." And now the mounting distresses of the country prove the fact beyond question. Look at this statement in a private letter from Vienna, written by a trusted American resident in the city:

> Industrial and economic conditions show no improvement in Austria. On the contrary, in an effort to reduce overhead expenses, more and more help is being laid off. There were four thousand suicides in Vienna during 1929, and what was most shocking was the fact that the majority of these unfortunates were under thirty years of age! The motive in most cases, according to the police report, was destitution and unemployment.

In confirmation of this statement comes the news that the Vienna Ethical Society, impressed by the increasing number of suicides, has "set up a service station for those dissatisfied with life, to the extent of needing aid and comfort to save them from ending it." (See the *Standard,* February issue, page 171.) From May 22, 1928, to the end of October, 1929, this station was visited by more than two thousand persons. Such a situation calls for action. The only effective action possible, is, of course, the union of Austria and Germany. But this France will not permit, no matter what the cost in misery and death. Hence, the resort of a desperate people to the present *Heimwehr* movement (see the *World Tomorrow,* February issue, page 80), with its threat of violence and revolution! If the League would really aid Austria, let Geneva insist upon its union with the *Reich.*

Well, *well,* WELL! So Nicholas Murray Butler is a Prohibitionist, after all!! It seems incredible. For years the distinguished President of Columbia has been vociferating against the Eighteenth Amendment in words to make the welkin ring. In the sacred name of liberty he has denounced this tyrannical and oppressive law, and called for its repeal. Nay, more than this, he has challenged his fellow-citizens to defy it without waiting for its repeal. Thus, in his presidential address at the opening of Columbia last fall, Mr. Butler laid down the principle of "the higher lawlessness," and declared that, as free citizens, we had a right to select what laws we would obey and disobey. But now see what has happened! President Butler's particular world, of course, is his University. He rules his campus just as President Hoover rules America—only with an infinitely greater sweep and power of authority, since he makes laws as well as executes them. He controls, in other words, the life, conduct, and personal habits of the citizens of his realm, who are the faculty and students of Columbia. He can control them, that is to say, if he so chooses. And he chooses with a gusto which shames a Bishop Cannon! Thus, smoking is prohibited—yes, *prohibited*—in the buildings of Columbia University by authority of President Butler. This would seem to be legislation exactly identical with the Eighteenth Amendment—an interference with personal conduct in the interest of public safety. If the one law is right, why not the other? Recently this prohibition law at Columbia has been widely ignored by the students. Now comes a decree from Nicholas Murray Butler that the anti-smoking rules must be enforced. Yes, *enforced!* But if President Butler may enforce a prohibition law against smoking in Columbia, why may not President Hoover enforce a prohibition law against drinking in the country at large? And if, according to Butler, there is a "higher lawlessness," which justifies citizens in defying Washington, why is there not a "higher lawlessness" which justifies students in defying the University? President Butler, with incredible stupidity, has given away his whole case. Consistency, thou art a jewel!

One need not be a fanatical anti-Red to deplore the way the Communists use their children in this country to serve their purposes of agitation. The exploitation of children is to us an abhorrent thing, whether it be exploitation by capitalists in textile factories and coal-mines, or exploitation by Communists in street meetings and demonstration parades. Reform, even revolution, may be important, but why not leave the business to older persons, of mature years and experience, who may be presumed to know something about the issues involved? As it is today, youngsters of fifteen, twelve, even ten years of age, are thrust into the battle-line, with results that are shocking to

any sensitive mind. Take such an episode as the following, for example, reported in a New York newspaper:

> A procession of 250 children, members of the Young Pioneers of America, a junior branch of the Communist party, clashed yesterday afternoon with two patrolmen. . . . . The demonstration started in front of the Children's Court, where one of the members of the young Communists organization, which is limited to children between the ages of 10 and 15, was to be released from a reformatory sentence. . . . Forming in column of twos, the children marched east to Third Avenue. . . . When the police tore up their Red placards, the children jostled about the officers jeering, screaming and shoving.

This must have been a lovely sight! The police were undoubtedly foolish to start an altercation with children, but what are we to think of an organization which deliberately puts its boys and girls into the battle-line, to fight the police of a great city? When soldiers in war use women and children as a screen against the enemy, we call them cowards. We regard the American Communists as similarly cowards in using their children to bear the brunt of public agitation under dangerous conditions. We know the answer of our Communist brethren—that American children are being trained in public schools, Sunday schools, parochial schools, to serve the existing order. But if Communists are going to do the same, or worse, on their side, where are we getting any forwarder? Save the children from the brawls of their elders, is our motto!

President Faunce, dead on January 31st last, was a highly successful college executive. It was during his administration, and under his immediate guidance and inspiration, that Brown became something more than a small college of local importance. It was his leadership, also, which demonstrated that our higher institutions of learning need not necessarily abandon the ministry as a source of supply for presidential material. Eliot's day at Harvard which made all things new in the college world, seemed to end forever the chance of any clergyman ever again being president of a great university. But Faunce reasserted, and vindicated, the old tradition. As a preacher, Faunce was gifted with exceptional graces. He had a keen mind, a charming personality, and a beautiful written and spoken style. Intellectually and spiritually, however, he was a Modernist in the worst rather than the best sense of that highly abused word. In his case there was no hewing to the line, letting the chips fall where they may. On the contrary, there was constitutional timidity in facing issues, and ready adjustment to any situation demanding either compromise or trouble. More than once speakers were denied a hearing at Brown because nothing controversial could be discussed on the campus. In the War Dr. Faunce, for years one of the most eminent and influential of peace leaders, climbed onto the band-wagon of militarism, and played his part in the pageant of America at war. We never contemplate a man of this type—cultivated, scholarly, gracious, highly competent, eminently successful, a leader, not so much by right of genius or power as by virtue of an easy and graceful adaptability to the safe side of every question—but what we wonder if prestige and honor in this world cannot be bought at too high a price.

Science the Peace Maker?

During the Christmas holiday season it is customary for the presidents of various learned societies to address their colleagues and indirectly the public on some of the broader aspects of the field of investigation to which they are devoted. One of the more challenging of these addresses delivered this winter was by the president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Robert A. Millikan. Professor Millikan has for some years shown an active interest in the bearing of science on religion. He has written and lectured on the subject, contending that while Fundamentalism is in conflict with science, Modernism not only is not so, but is positively supported by science. Correctly interpreted, interpreted that is, according to the theories of Modernism, all the great objectives of religious faith are safeguarded, he has insisted, by the results of scientific investigations. And he has made it clear that in his view Fundamentalism and along with Fundamentalism, Atheism, Agnosticism and contemporary Humanism are so many ways of opposing the deeper spiritual truths revealed by scientific knowledge.

In his more recent address Professor Millikan went farther. He issued a comprehensive reply to what seem to him the important current accusations against scientific investigation. His theory and method are illustrated in his treatment of the relation of science to war. As we all know, it has come to be widely believed that science has made war more deadly and more horrible, and that science has put into the hands of men bent upon destruction the power to wipe out their fellows in masses heretofore inconceivable. Many of us suspect that able men are secretly engaged on the problem of inventing the most devastating means of destroying life it is possible to invent. Against this whole conception Professor Millikan enters the list.

The contention he makes is somewhat as follows: Anyone who is anxious to see beyond his nose (Professor Millikan habitually finds people short sighted who do not agree with him in these matters) will find ten times as many new peaceful and constructive uses of scientific results as destructive ones. "Explosives and fertilizers are basically the same, and even explosives find a dozen peaceful uses to one warlike one."

The trouble is that "public thinking is misled by the fact that a new horror makes better news than a wheat crop. One man blown painlessly to atoms gets more space than a thousand men dying by inches from disease." And as for the danger seen by such men as Professor Frederick Soddy of Oxford, the danger of wholesale destruction of mankind by the deliberate release of sub-atomic energy, Professor Millikan pooh-poohs the idea. There is no evidence for it whatever. That so-called danger is, he asserts, the creation of panicky nerves: it is, "like most of the bugaboos which crowd in on the mind of ignorance." He assures men, like Professor Soddy, "who are living in fear lest some bad boy among the scientists may some day touch off the fuse and blow this comfortable earth of ours to star-dust" that they "may go home and henceforth sleep in peace with the consciousness that the Creator has put some fool-proof elements into His handiwork, and that man is powerless to do it any titanic physical damage, anyway."

Nor does he leave the argument at this more or less negative stage. It is his positive contention that science will save mankind from war.

> In my judgment (he says), war is now in the process of being abolished, chiefly by the relentless advance of science, its most powerful enemy. It has existed in spite of religion, and in spite of philosophy, and in spite of social ethics, and in spite of the Golden rule, since the days of the cave man because and simply because in accordance with the evolutionary philosophy of modern science it has had a survival value.

But the world as it is being remade by science will not permit it to survive. War

> . . . . will disappear like the dinosaurs when, and only when, the conditions which have given it survival value have disappeared, and those conditions are disappearing now, primarily because of changes in the world situation brought about by the growth of modern science.

Unfortunately, many people are prone to be misled by this type of argument. Optimistic by temperament or tradition and predisposed to believe in some sort of world-tendency which is bound to work, however slowly, for ultimate human good, they are very ready to believe that evils which are difficult to cope with will somehow be taken care of in the march of progress. And they get a profound feeling of assurance from the conviction that it is something in the very nature of things, something in the world-process, rather than in human purposes and plans, which is to eventuate in the results they desire. Naturally then they are not difficult to persuade that the most conspicuous power evident about them should be looked to as the agent of blessing. And the power most conspicuous in contemporary life is obviously science. In other days there might have been other candidates for this honor, but today the ruling influence, to which all others, even business and industry, are regarded as secondary, is science.

But if we examine the argument a little the prospect held out in it is not so bright. The mere accumulation of knowledge and power does not guarantee a proper use of it. William James once said:

> In my time there has been in Eastern Massachusetts no enterprise of public or private rascality that has not been organized or led by a Harvard man.

And if for "Eastern Massachusetts" you read, as F. C. Sharp suggests, "cities of the United States" and for Harvard man, "college man," you get a statement which, he correctly says, "is near enough to the truth to be an extremely disquieting fact." It simply is not true that the accumulation of facts will automatically result in the volitions which are calculated to make socially beneficial use of those facts.

As regards international understanding and cooperation there is needed first of all a certain disposition of the will. The Right Hon. Arthur Henderson, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has expressed the idea exactly.

> We must (he said), have a new conception, a spiritual conception, of the general relationship of all the nations of the world. We must recognize that the vital interests of the nations are not in conflict, but on the contrary, are common interests which they cannot help but share.

And anyone who looks at the world of men realistically, as a scientist should but very often does not, will realize what a stupendous job is involved in making this will to co-operation prevail within, to say nothing of beyond, our borders. Paralyzing lack of faith and stubborn traditions appear to many thoughtful people to be quite insuperable. Just at present conditions seem somewhat hopeful, but it would be innocence to the point of silliness to disregard the precariousness of even the present hopeful movements. Instead of talking as if the appeal to force will become less and less popular as a by-product of greater interest in scientific research, we need to use every means to spread among men the attitude of mind and heart with which a different ideal of life is inseparably connected. As the hands and feet of such an ideal, science can indeed accomplish much for peace and good will.

But the outlawry of the appeal to might is not only dependent upon disposition or will; the means and instruments must be devised for its realization and perpetuation. And this again is a difficult problem. Habits must be developed, customs built up, institutions created. If this turns out to be impossible, not only will the co-operative spirit prove futile, but it will degenerate into mere sentimentalism. What are the chances that these habits, customs, and institutions will arise incidentally from the furtherance of scientific research? Very nearly zero. The task is one which calls for all the skill of social scientists, religious leaders, and philosophers. Even then we may fail. But the end is so much to be desired, the stakes so large, and the possibility so inviting that the risk of failure should deter no one from making his share of the trial or to encourage others in their efforts. At all events, the results of scientific research may be used for evil as well as for good ends, and there is no guarantee in

the results themselves, nor, apparently, in a cosmic being or tendency, that they will be used only for ultimate human good. Science, as we have been told, is a tool, a tool that may be used to save or to kill. Whether the contribution made by scientific research is to further peace among men or to intensify animosity, will depend upon the rise of moral leaders whose theory disagrees with the theory of Professor Millikan's address, and who know how to apply their contrary conviction. M. C. Otto.

Jottings

What does a cancelled subscription mean? Lots of things! (2) *Rage against a statement or opinion which, because it is true, cannot be answered.*

(To be continued)

R.O.T.C.—Reserve Officers Training Corps.
R.O.T.—C!
ROT—C!!
Rot—See?

In one issue (February), the *American Mercury* prophecies the continuance of the family as a beneficent institution, deplores the masculinization of women and the consequent loss of romance, praises an American politician, and says a good word for God. Mr. H. L. Mencken is losing his grip!

A Danish statesman declares that American moving pictures are fit only for "half-wild people." He goes on to say that Russian films are "culturally miles beyond the American." It's lucky that this man lives in Denmark and not in the land of the D. A. R.'s!

Bankrupt Chicago, faced with the alternative of raising money to pay interest on bonds or to pay overdue wages of employees, choses to pay the interest. Thus once again are the rich taken care of, and the poor left to provide for themselves as best they can.

At last! Here is a cheerful and comforting word for the unemployed. Says Prof. D. D. Lescohier, of the University of Washington,

> Unemployment is beneficial to industry. It serves to redistribute population and creates new sources of workers for new industries.

The next time we see a jobless man, worrying about his starving family, we shall tell him this for his encouragement. J. H. H.

"Headlong America"

First Impressions

(Concluded from last week.)

Inevitably, things material have assumed an importance in our eyes disproportionate to their real worth. All the Babbitts, the idlers on Main Street, and the natives of Gopher Prairie are on the *qui vive* for something "bigger and better"—bigger cars, better radio sets, larger theatres, movies that not only move but talk as well, jazzier jazz, more expensive antiques, refrigerators and heating-systems that manage themselves, *et cetera ad infinitum.* No one could safely deny that increased prosperity for even a few does bring with it more leisure which in turn may be utilized in the pursuit of culture, learning, refinement, and other good things of life. If this sequence is followed there would appear to be a nexus between prosperity and the *summum bonum.* But if leisure merely makes it possible for a man to become the slave of another set of things, the vicious circle becomes complete. Prosperity thus has no contribution to make to "the good life." Is this what is taking place in the United States?

On several occasions, friends have taken me and my family on automobile tours. I have usually occupied the front seat at the side of my host, who has been driving. On such trips my primary purpose has been to draw out my friends and learn what has been going on in their heads. The topics upon which most of these Americans wax eloquent have been: stocks, "my house," motor roads, automobiling mishaps, "my business,"—all purely materialistic considerations. One observant person has expressed the opinion to me that Americans are so busy handling things—mere things—and thinking in terms of things that ideals and ideas receive little, if any, attention. Another friend, connected with one of our finer colleges, remarked that it is less and less possible to interest the American youth in idealism, service and sacrifice for high purposes. "Eat, drink and be merry," seems to sum up the unconscious philosophy of many a descendant of the Pilgrim Fathers.

Another impression I have gained is that much is being done to improve health. The ancient game of golf is in high favor. Thousands are taking it up. The increase in the quality and number of municipal courses is conclusive proof that golf has come to stay. This is a definitely healthy tendency in American life. Further, making due allowances for the cunning trickery of tailors and style makers, there is no question but that changes in women's styles point to a trend that will improve health and lengthen life. The men are notably slow in this regard. How long will we remain the slaves of our masters—the stiff collar, tight belts and evening dress shirts?

In conclusion, the conviction that is everlastingly being forced upon me is that we are totally incapable of looking at ourselves objectively and critically. We are provincially-minded. One extreme example—I confess it to be too extreme to indicate anything at

all—was when a traveler from Kobe, Japan, was in a Pullman smoker. Someone asked him where he came from. He replied: "I live in Kobe." The questioner then remarked, "Ah, yes, that is that town in Alabama." The disinclination to be critical of one's self and one's country was shown when a group of which I was a member was discussing the United States—her history, institutions, psychology and international policies. Lost in interest in the discussion, one member of the group, a government official, had made several contributions to the group's thinking. He had indicated various new attitudes that might be developed to the advantage of all. However, as the group dispersed, he "came to himself," as it were, recovered his habitual "stuffy" attitude and declared, "Well, anyway, I believe the United States is the most altruistic nation in the world." I could not count easily the occasions upon which, after an attempt to get my friends to look at themselves and their country objectively, I have met the rebuff, "You are un-American."

O wad some power the giftie gie us,
To see oursels as others see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder frae us
And foolish notion.

But Burns was not an American. I understand that magazine writers, social workers, educationalists and preachers who frankly discuss controversial subjects and attempt critical analyses soon become unpopular. Their light is soon snuffed out. Or they are ignored. And the result is the same.

If you think that Americans are open-minded and self-analytical and friendly to suggestion, may I ask what your reaction is to this! Most Americans seem wholly unaware that the United States is the most unpopular member in the family of nations? Prosperity seems to have so thoroughly clogged our thinking processes that we just simply cannot sense the situation. Our failure to recognize the United States of Soviet Republics and our 1924 Immigration Laws make us hated in the Far East. Our Caribbean policy and Monroe Doctrine—this latter long ago having served its purpose—create hostility to the South. Our reparations policy in Europe completes the picture. President Hoover's statement that at the present rate of increase, we will be spending in 1933 for national defense five hundred and thirty million dollars more than in any pre-war year is not world news calculated to make other nations hate us any the less. This is, of course, offset to some extent by the very real advance made in our proposal of the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact and in the Peace Parley now in session. Our unpopularity is entirely unnecessary. The biggest frog in the puddle can best afford to make room for lesser frogs. We can best afford to forego war. By the same token we can do most to prevent it. By the same token our temptation to yield to the lust for power is greatest and most subtle. If we will it, suspicion can be removed and by creative goodwill, we can almost single-handed build a world where mutual trust and respect can be the big-stone of the structure. Will we be able to lay claim to the moral leadership of the world? Or, will we continue to remain under the delusion that we already have it The line is being more and more sharply drawn between the pacifists, peace-patriots and internationally-minded on the one hand, and the American Legion, Daughters of the American Revolution and super-nationalists on the other hand. Which fork in the road will the United States take—the road to imperialism, domination over weaker nations and national self-consciousness or the road to humanitarianism, self-realization through service to mankind and respect for other races and cultures?

One would naturally look to the religious and moral leaders to strike the note of warning and hope. The preaching, teaching and practice by us Americans of a vital religion—for example, among Christians, the religion of Jesus rather than the religion about Jesus—would immediately release spiritual forces more than able to cope with the situation. Anything less dynamic will fail to shatter the present day mind-set. But religious leaders everywhere seem to be too engrossed in something like the following: (1) campaigns for "bigger and better" church buildings and physical equipment, (2) ecclesiasticism and its accompaniments, and (3) attempts to overcome what might be termed their defeatism and sense of frustration, often by stressing some antipathy—antipathy to another sect, antipathy to other races, antipathy to other classes. There is nothing positive or constructive about this. It is so essentially Nordic and quaint!

Conversely, it would be possible to create a totally different type of religious life with the following component parts: (1) stressing and laying hold upon the divine-human forces in the universe—the spiritual and cultural elements in life—with utter disregard for material circumstances and church equipment. That is, *real* worship can take place in a barn as well as in a cathedral; (2) a religious life, which pays but scant attention to ritualism, has its roots down deep in creative worship and fellowship and uncompromisingly attacks social evils—capitalism, militarism, prostitution, lynching and the like—and so create a United States where men can live together as brothers, the children of the Father of all men; and (3) self-criticism and humility, with charity toward all men, tolerance toward those who differ, respect for alien cultures and regard for the different roads by which other religionists are climbing toward God.

"Where there is no vision the people perish." Will American civilization survive or perish?

THEODORE DEMAREST WALSER.

Song for the Troubadour

The leader of the wavering line
That is marching forever west
Has a pack that makes an arc of his spine
And a hollow curve of his chest.

A flame in the sky is leading him on
Over the perilous crags;
Into the eye of the setting sun
Where the red horizon sags.

The leader of the pilgrims sings
While strumming a shrill guitar,
And the rich blood spurts from quivering strings
Down on the gay bazaar.

A few may heed the song of the blood
As the desolate dreams go by,
But the world shall thirst for the crimson flood
When the wells of his soul are dry.

A. M. SULLIVAN.

Upon the Gentle Art of Being "Colored"

An Interpretation

It was in the Boston subway, at the Park Street station. We were all hurrying, as we must to take the car to Brookline. A woman tripped and fell against the man in front of her and pushed him not altogether gently against the car. As both recovered their balance he turned and looked at the woman. Had she been young, attractive and Nordic, what might have happened is purely academic. She was not young, though becomingly dressed, and she was not Nordic. On the contrary, she was distinctly Negro. I understand that we never lose our tempers in the presence of our superiors. This is done, if done at all, toward one whom we feel to be inferior. I thought I saw an apology tremble upon her lips. If so, it was frozen by the glare of his eyes, and the tempestuousness of his language as he poured out upon her a torrent of vituperation, ending with a threat to have her arrested if she ever did that again. Then we all mounted the car, which promptly moved off. We all had to stand, and the man disappeared among the crowd behind. A white woman appeared to whisper a word of solace. I looked at the impassive face—holding back I know not what, and longed to ask, "My good woman, how long do you have to live to get used to such treatment?" But I forbore. Soon the car moved out of the subway into Boylston street and the incident passed.

A few days later I called upon a friend, a woman in business in Boston. In the course of conversation she said that during the winter she had taken a course of evening lectures upon law. She was not planning ever to practice, but she felt that a knowledge of law would be helpful in business. The class was composed entirely of women and among them were three colored women, two of whom had the intellectual right to be there. My friend said, "It was a hard place for them, and the woman who made it hardest for them was one who claimed to be a descendant of the 'Mayflower.'"

These incidents occurred in Boston. A number of years ago I asked a young colored man from the South, a student in the University of Chicago, how it seemed to be in God's country. His reply disabused while it startled me, "I do not like it here. At home I know where I am not wanted and I save myself by remaining away. Here I do not know where I am not wanted and I find myself frequently embarrassed."

Whenever it happens, whether by invitation or by chance, that a Northern man gets into conversation with a Southern man, the conversation sooner or later turns upon the race problem. And if the man from the North ventures to take up cudgels for the Negro, the discussion is closed by the question, "Do you wish your daughter to marry a Negro?" This question is supposed to point toward the crux of the situation. But I doubt if it does. The Negro is not obsessed with the desire to marry into white families, or to associate with them on familiar terms. Some years ago a college student secured a place with a white family as general utility man for the summer. The family offered him a room in the house and wished him to spend his nights there. But he said, "I could not spend my nights there; there were no colored people to talk to." The same idea was more publicly expressed by the speaker at the recent commencement of a large colored school, the speaker himself being a man of more than local prominence. He said, in effect: "The white people are afraid of us; they are afraid that we wish to marry among them, and to find our social life with them. Not so! We are happy to live among ourselves."

The idea that the Negro is ambitious to enter white society through the gateway of marriage may be dismissed and dismissed absolutely. The Anglo-Saxon blood has never been diluted by an infusion of African blood; or if it has, the amount is so slight as to be a wholly negligible quantity. That Negro blood has been diluted—or enriched, if you wish to put it that way—the millions of mixed people in the United States bear witness. That is, there are practically none of mixed parentage who can point to the maternal side for the white admixture; they all point to the paternal side. In my college days my chum and I attended a Chautauqua at Madison, Wisconsin. We went to listen to the then Senator from South Carolina speak upon race relations. In a pause in the address a strident voice in the audience called out, "How do you explain the mulatto?" Quick as a pistol shot, and straight as a blow from the shoulder came the reply, "The Southern white man is a brute; but he proposes to defend his women." We understood that the Senator accepted on the part of the Southern white man the paternity of the mulatto.

The following incident is suggestive. A prominent business man of the Negro group was dining at the Adams House on Washington Street, Boston. He could have passed for a white man even in his own city save that he had been so long associated with the colored group that everyone, white and colored alike, accepted him as colored. Seated at a table he noticed that the waiter was leading a prominent business man of his own city to the table where he was sitting. He endeavored without success to catch the eye of the waiter, but the two men found themselves opposite each other at the same table. Not specially troubled on his own account, but wishing to be courteous to the other, the colored man said, "If my being here is unpleasant to you, I will gladly change my seat." Now the other might have said, "Jones, we are a thousand miles from home. Let us put aside the home traditions and meet here as man to man. How is business with you?" The brutal reply was, "Henry, if Boston can stand you, perhaps I can." There could hardly be much conversation after that remark.

No! The fundamentals are deeper. I quote from a book published some years ago, but the truth stated is as true now as then:

> The underlying thought of the Negro upon the factors of his situation is, on the whole, saner than that of Southern white folk. "Forty acres and a mule" long since ceased to have attraction. He does not ask for charity, but he does ask justice. He is not ashamed to be a Negro, but he is angered at the restrictions that his African lineage place upon him. All he asks is that the Democratic spirit that we fought for shall come to him and to his children.

Two years ago a southern correspondent to a local paper, commenting upon a report of a convention of white and colored women in Pennsylvania who were debating the question, "How can we solve the race

problem?" said, "There is no race problem for the colored man who is industrious, frugal and who manages to get hold of a farm in the country in fee simple or to own a home in the city."

Now this is true of our foreign citizens whether originally anarchistic, communistic, socialistic, or Bolshevistic. The moment such a one manages to become the owner of a house or of a piece of property, or of a small but growing bank account, he passes naturally and easily and doubtless finally out of the laboring class, though still a laborer, into the capitalistic class by sheer force of circumstances. This is one of the elements in our labor problem, especially in the mining regions where the opportunity does not open to the miner to become a householder, so that he remains permanently of the social group that he was in before coming to America.

There can be no question that the Negro who owns a home in the city or a farm in the country is the more valuable asset to the community or the state in which he lives; but that ownership does not materially change the "race problem" so far as he is concerned. I question at this point if the Southern white man really gets the point of view of the Negro. The Negro finds so many situations in which a "social" element seems to enter which puzzle and limit him. Some illustrations will make this point more clear. These are taken out of Atlanta but doubtless could find duplicates in any Southern city.

I attended the State Fair on Saturday. There were interesting exhibits, but as I wandered from building to building, the colored man was conspicuous by his absence. I did see one group of six young men and doubtless there were others, but there was no large group of colored folk in attendance. I learned that in the past when they did attend they found so many of the side-shows closed to them and to their children that finally they asked for a Negro day. This was granted, but even then the colored children found many an attractive merry-go-round or other similar amusement closed to them. It is here that the "social element" enters in, and this to my mind interferes considerably with the gate receipts.

I attended some time ago a radio exhibit at the Auditorium. It was an interesting exhibit, but again, during the two or more hours that I was there, the Negro was not present. I know certain lads of the Tech High School who have been interested enough in radio to make sets for their own use and even to earn money by making sets for their neighbors. Also, I know certain colored youth who have done the same thing for themselves and their neighbors. There is in Atlanta a group of colored people who are intelligent upon radio. They might have been glad to have attended the exhibition; they might have given some orders. But they were not there, at least, when I was. A group of colored students might have attended to learn something about radio; or a company of youth and maidens; or a more dignified group of married people. They might have been welcome; I do not know; they are not sure, and so they save themselves embarrassment by remaining away. Likewise, at the automobile show, colored people were not there. Plenty of Atlanta's colored citizens own cars. These and others would have been interested in this exhibit. But they feel themselves unwelcome and again save themselves by not attending.

Some months ago we had at the High Art Museum a most interesting exhibition of paintings loaned from the Metropolitan Art Museum of New York. I visited the Museum during the week and was so much interested in the pictures that on Sunday my wife and I spent two hours at the Museum. They were two hours of rich enjoyment, and a part of our pleasure was in a certain camaraderie with those present, so that we conversed with people that we did not know as well as with those that we did know. The common interest served as a temporary introduction. I saw two colored persons present, one was a maid and the other the janitor. There are in this city colored people who have been abroad. They have visited the Louvre, they have been in Florence, in Munich, in London. They love color as they love music. They would have enjoyed these pictures. Perhaps they would have been welcome. They know better than I. And as they were not there, I assume that they saved themselves embarrassment by remaining away.

I am not a doctor, but I had an errand that called me twice to the auditorium during a medical convention. I did not attend any of the sessions. I cannot say that colored physicians were not in attendance. All that I can say is that during the two times that I was there I did not see any colored physicians. If there is any gathering where white and colored can get together and forget that which I have called the "social element" it would seem to be at a medical convention. It may be said in rejoinder that the colored physicians had had a recent clinic at Tuskegee Institute, at which distinguished physicians and surgeons of their own group and it may be representatives of the other group had given lectures and demonstrations. If any white physician of Alabama or of a neighboring state had wished to hear such lectures or to witness such clinics he would have been heartily welcomed at Tuskegee. I do not feel so sure of the welcome if a group of colored physicians had wished to attend the white convention.

The Negro has been to school since 1865, with numbers increasing annually. He has studied the history of the United States, sometimes from text-books written from the Northern standpoint and sometimes from those written from the Southern standpoint. It make no difference which. Either from the one or from the other he has learned that the Revolutionary war arose out of the insistence of the principle that "taxation without representation is unjust and intolerable." Let it be understood that there is no law in the South that prevents the Negro from voting. Senator Borah conceded as much. Nevertheless, the Negro does not vote. The white Democratic primary is equivalent to an election. At the polls those of us who go, go simply to register the primary ticket, and precious few of us do even that. The only solution of the problem of "voting" is for the establishment of a Republican primary. No one ever votes himself out of power. The white Democrats are in power. For the white Southern Republicans to have any possibility of getting into power they must ally themselves with the colored Republicans, and that brings in again the "social element" and you are up against a stone wall.

Those of the colored people who have thought the thing through, think of themselves and speak of themselves as a "subject" people and not as "citizens." The Negro feels that to a large extent the situation for

him parallels that in Russia or in Germany prior to the Great War, a situation in which there was accorded to the masses all the rights of being industrious, frugal, and of property-holding; but the government was always in the hands of a small ruling class. We all know that out of Russia and out of Germany have come novelists, poets, great musicians, artists, philosophers, scientists, financiers. Denied any voice in their own goveriment, the creative minds have found expression in these many ways to the enrichment of the world's thought and literature. Their only contribution to government has shown itself in the gospel of protest against things as they are (were) in the preaching of anarchy, socialism, communism, and Bolshevism.

Something similar is going on here in the South. We listen, charmed by the voice of a Roland Hayes; we go to Tuskegee and stand in amazement at the constructive genius of a Booker T. Washington; we listen to the "Brer Rabbit" stories told as only Southern people can tell them; we read Paul Lawrence Dunbar, the only American poet that has a reading public at all comparable with the great poets of the early part of the nineteenth century, Bryant, Whittier, Longfellow. We recognize the artistic side of the Negro and pay him homage in many ways. We forget or do not know that there is a group of Negro writers who, denied any expression along governmental lines, are writing along the lines of protest.

In a réport of an address by a Southern white Republican in Richmond, Virginia, some time ago (1927) the speaker is reported as saying, "Now that the Negro understands and accepts as a fact that he will not be allowed to enter the office-holding class, if he would divide his vote he would break up the solid South." How this would work out cannot be told with any surety. The Negro, however, understands that with taxation and representation there goes the right to aspire to hold office. He looks over the map and wonders if anywhere in the South any colored man holds an elective office. He finds himself arrested by a white policeman, tried by a white judge, if his case is important enough it is decided by a white jury and the decision is carried out by a white court. His taxes are assessed by a white assessor, collected by a white collector at a window marked "colored." In the government at Washington and in the states south of the Potomac, he fails to find any representative of his own group who can discuss officially from the colored standpoint, matters that affect him. Whatever he gets—and he is getting much more than formerly—comes to him as a largess out of the bounty and the sympathy of the ruling class. At the dedication of a home for colored orphans, at which representatives of the city fathers were present, the statement was made that "We (the white) are going to give you (the colored) a new Junior High School." This school is needed badly, and the Negroes are grateful. But they have had no word in the matter save the right to petition. In this case as in others, the petition has been granted.

This seems to illustrate that the situation is not so much racial as political. There is a two-party government, the lines, however, being drawn along lines of racial cleavage, with the white party entrenched in power and not disposed to share it.

Be that as it may, there is a time when the vote of the Negro counts. Forty or more years ago a Georgia city debated the question of "wet" or "dry." The "drys" knew that they could not carry the city against the white "wets" alone. The colored vote was invited and the promise was made that if the "drys" were successful, the city would build a colored school as good as the one it was planning to build for the whites. The city went "dry" and the promise was carried out to the letter. I was in the fine brick building built up to the standards of forty years ago. I thought the millenium was approaching. Several years afterwards I called at the Negro school and found it located in a wooden shack on the edge of the city. The excellent building of an earlier day had been taken for the white children and the colored children placed in this shack (and it was a shack). Later, the city redeemed itself in part; the new colored school is more nearly in the center of the Negro population, but it is by no means equal to the building which the Negroes originally possessed and from which they were dispossessed.

The best school building in Atlanta for colored children for forty years, a building that compared favorably with the buildings built at that time for the white children, was the outcome of a similar situation, where the vote of the Negroes aided the white in securing a "dry" Atlanta. Several years ago a bond issue was proposed, but no guarantees were made the Negroes, they did not vote and the bond issue failed to carry. Later, a second attempt was made to carry a bond issue for public schools and public improvements. Promises were made and the Negroes with the whites carried the issue, by a community vote of both races. In fulfilment of the agreement four large grammar school buildings were erected and a large High School was added to the colored public schools. While no one of these is completed according to the plans, and while they are still inadequate for the numbers of Negro children, they are a great improvement over the previous buildings, being decidedly up to date.

I am trying to present the point of view of the colored man. He is not colored by choice; neither is he ashamed of his color. But he frequently finds that his color limits his action and denies him certain things he could have if he were not colored. Coming out of the Court House where I had gone to pay my taxes, I noticed a drinking fountain that bore this legend, "for whites." Noticing another across the hall, I was curious to see what it might say, and I found again the legend, "for whites." I am still wondering what provision is made for the thirsty brother in black. It is in this way that he is finding at many a turn that which seems to him, and seems to me, to be a limitation to his righteous freedom of action. He enters the street car with the crowd, but he must leave it by the rear door; if there is an elevator marked "for colored" he must take it, even though it fills with representatives of the other group. They may ride with him, but he must not ride with them. I sometimes think that the only time the Negro forgets, not that he is colored, but the limitations which being colored forces upon him, is the time when in his own car he takes what seat he wishes and finds no signs on the way, "This road for whites only."

I said above that the problem is not so much racial as political. A Negro lecturer addressing a college audience in California, said that the problem is an economic one. I did not accept this at first. But quite

recently my attention has been called to an incident that seems to clarify my thought. In a city which from the southern standpoint is northern and from the northern standpoint is southern, a group of music lovers asked if they might not secure better seats than are usually allotted to colored patrons. The manager called the group into his private office and stated the case after this fashion, "You know that your people contribute almost nothing to this sort of thing. You also know as well as I do that if I were to sell you the seats that you wish they would be all the seats we would sell. You see that that is the business of it." I had never heard it put quite so baldly. It illustrates the tremendous power of the boycott.

A most interesting chapter of medieval history is the story of the rise of the "third estate." There were the lords temporal and the lords spiritual; below them the great mass of serfs. Gradually as one outcome of the Crusades there was a revival of intercourse between the Orient and the Occident. I quote,

> As industries, trade and commerce increased the craftsmen and merchants grew in wealth and in importance. They were soon able to rival the clergy in education and the nobility in the luxury of their dwellings and their living. The "burgher" class came to have recognized position by the side of the clergy and the nobility and the King was forced to take counsel with them to retain their support. This development of industry and commerce, with the growth of town and city life, this rise of a "third estate" is one of the most noteworthy changes of the late Middle Ages.

Now the Negro has his upper and his lower class; his intelligentsia and his laboring class. His doctors, dentists, lawyers, educated clergy, teachers and publicists compose the one; the great body of Negro laborers, skilled and unskilled, compose the other. These are the renters in the country and the laborers in the cities. Between these two groups there is no large group corresponding to the "burgher" or the "bourgeois" class, the great middle class that gives character to our Western civilization. The Negro needs more doctors, more dentists, more good lawyers, more educated preachers of the Gospel, more and better trained teachers, more and more efficient publicists. But beneath these is the imperative need of a strong middle class, merchants, manufacturers, commercial business houses that shall represent financial interests of so large an extent that they must be taken into the counsels of the city, the state and the nation. Six decades have brought to the Negro much more than his most sanguine friends could have hoped for in 1865. Within the next six decades we should see the development of this middle class. The Negro colleges are recognizing this and are introducing courses in business and in administration that may prepare ambitious young colored men for a new line of work and a new opportunity for effective service.

A sociologist of forty or more years ago wrote a sentence which reads about as follows: "The time is approaching when industry will be controlled by a small group of very wealthy capitalists, served by a corps of high salaried and very efficient superintendents, and resting upon a great body of unskilled laborers." A more modern comment in the same line comes from a book published in 1925. "There is a basis for a joke about the man who applied for a position as an experienced mechanic, because he had worked in a Ford plant for four years. 'What did you do?' he was asked. His reply was, 'I put on bolt No. 47.' The result of standardization and specialization on cost of product is well known. What its monotony will do to the man by reducing his ingenuity and leaving his capacities undeveloped is not yet known. This universal correlative of manufacturing is one of the problems of our age. Experiments seem to show that a chimpanzee or an orang-outang could learn to do many of the jobs of a modern factory, but spiritually would he stand for it."

It is a tremendous question, what is to be the effect upon the mentality of the millions of our American laborers whose individual contribution to the economic life of the nation is as simple as "putting on bolt No. 47" for Henry Ford. The question that arises out of our theme is: What is to be the effect upon the mentality of our colored Americans, as they continue to find themselves under restrictions and limitations in which they have no voice and out of which there seems no way of escape?

There came to me on June 25, 1928, a letter with a sentence which so illustrates this situation that I quote it, though not in any sense as propaganda. This is the sentence:

> After all, the glory of our country is that one does not have to be born into presidental rank, or into any other certain grade. Each of us is entitled to any position to which he can work himself up. Alfred E. Smith's rise to prominence has been an inspiration to countless thousands all over the country.

"Each of us is entitled to any position to which he can work himself up!" That is a clarion call to all the youth of our land save one, the youth of color. A prominent theologian in an American university went back to his fatherland at the call of the war and was killed by a stray bullet as he was trying to locate the graves of German soldiers. One of the most promising of our younger poets, went to the front and never came back. These but represent and illustrate how much of potential power was lost in the Great War. How much of potential power is also lost to the world because of the restrictions and the limitations under which the Afro-American labors for self-expression!

The South then has reached a "going stage." I venture to predict that it is also a fluidal stage. That is I predict a revolution, not such a one as overthrew the Romanoffs, the Hapsburgs and Hohenzollerns, but one like that which has taken place in England during the last century, a bloodless revolution or evolution, if you prefer, by which the citizenry of England has become enlarged until it includes all. This shows itself today in the change of the British Empire into the British Commonwealth, a federal union of independent states. This is to be credited to the clear sense of the British who are always willing to listen to the point of view of the other group and to be affected by it.

In his "Social Evolution" Benjamin Kidd, in commenting upon the rise of the labor class from slavery through serfdom into the wage-earning class of today, remarks that "this outcome as we have it today was due not so much to the strength of the attack as to the weakening of the defence." Something of this same sort will slowly and quietly but surely come into the counsels of this nation as the decades come and go.

EDGAR H. WEBSTER.

Atlanta University.

The Study Table

"Today and Tomorrow"

It seems like a mark of supererogation to call the attention of UNITY readers to Mr. Holmes's latest book, "Palestine: Today and Tomorrow," for everyone who reads UNITY has had the privilege of following the editor for many weeks through that ancient and yet new country. In fact, Chapter I is composed of revised articles which appeared in UNITY as "pages from a traveler's note book." In these sketches the author gives intimate glimpses of various communities on the Mediterranean, such as Alexandria and Cairo, and then takes us into the heart of the holy land; both that portion of it which is reminiscent of the Biblical days, and those new villages which are being established by the Zionists of today. Mr. Holmes's vigorous and biting style etches unforgettable pictures, both of things lovely and of things squalid. The one word which stands out most prominently in this section of the volume is MUD; for everywhere Mr. Holmes went, torrential rains met him, until he had to plough, ride, tramp, ooze through streets, roads and fields that were veritable oceans of water and mud. But he also, despite the handicap, bravely persisted so that he saw what he went to see. The story he tells is anything but a Sunday school lesson sheet about the lilies of the field, and shepherds by the streams of living waters, but he reveals a Palestine poor, desperately, struggling, hoping, fighting, a very human picture of a vital corner of the world.

Mr. Holmes then briefly traces the movements of Jews from various motives and from various parts of the world to Palestine,—a clear analysis of the Zionist movement. Jews do not all come to the homeland for the same reason. Some are sick and want to die in the land of their God and of their fathers, some are holy men on sacred pilgrimages, some are refugees fleeing from persecution in other countries, some (and these are the real Zionists) came with the purpose of restoring their ancient home and of giving the Jews everywhere a symbol of corporate existence, a new birth of the ideals of the Old Testament prophets.

Then came the problems,—the almost insurmountable difficulties of every conceivable kind which face these new adventurers and call forth all there is of heroism in their long suffering souls. There is the general poverty of the country with hills denuded and fields laid waste. There is the climate with fierce rains and tropic heat. It is a land that in all probability never did "flow with milk and honey" and which apparently will always lack the natural resources for a large or very prosperous civilization. Worst of all at the present moment, there are the Arabs, a people who have inhabited the land for centuries, who have built their homes there, and sent their roots down into its soil and traditions. They are in the large majority and they naturally feel that the Jews are intruders who will eventually force them out of their rightful heritage. Everyone knows how acute this situation is because of the riots, or more accurately speaking, war which broke out between the two peoples last summer. And there are the British, whom Mr. Holmes seems to feel are definitely committed to imperialism in Zion as everywhere, who are not sympathetic or understanding of the Jewish aspirations, and who will probably continue to play their old game of divide and rule.

It is a dark picture and Mr. Holmes, while hopeful of the ultimate outcome, does not minimize any of the difficulties.

Finally, the author turns to the brighter aspects of the problem, for such there are, and chronicles the achievements which can be placed to the credit of these indomitable "prisoners of hope." One of the most interesting parts of the book is devoted to describing the different types of communities being built—for Zionists differ among themselves—some are radicals, others conservatives. The villages are slowly rising, and with them come the chief triumphs of the people, namely, schools, agriculture, health and a renaissance of the Jewish ideals of social justice.

It is Mr. Holmes's hope, and it will surely be shared by the great majority of UNITY readers, that Zion shall not be merely another one among too many nationalisms, but that it will be a new type of social order, a demonstration before the world of the workability of a civilization of brotherhood, a light to which the Gentiles may turn for inspiration and guidance.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

Palestine: Today and Tomorrow. A Gentile's Survey of Zionism. By John Haynes Holmes. The Macmillan Co. 271 pages. $2.50.

The Good Life

The editors of a religious journal offered a prize for the best children's story, and chose the best by reading the stories to their children. When this book* came to me I asked myself the question—Why not read it to my twelve-year-old boy? But it was with some fear that I announced my intention to him for I have learned by experience that he is impatient of any literature that does not quickly grip his attention. When he saw the title he said, "Ah, I don't want to hear that old stuff!"

While cutting the leaves I noticed that the book was in story form. So much the better! Presently I saw this heading: "How a Little Mouse Started a Great Stir." I stopped cutting leaves and read it aloud. The twelve-year-old boy listened with assumed reluctance, but the unfeigned interest shown by his little brother was contagious, and when I paused they both urged me to go on. After finishing that I started the first chapter. It was soon evident that whatever else might be said this was interesting to children. A complete reading convinces me that the facts are fairly presented throughout the book. This being true the point of greatest importance is the matter of interest. A few examples will show how attractively the material is planned for young minds.

Writing of the way Nature Worship began the author thus describes the inquisitive and imaginative nature of man:

"Not only did the Man of long ago ask questions, but he even tried to answer them.

"Now asking questions is one thing. Answering them is quite another.

"Anyone can ask questions. Anyone can ask: Why is the sky blue? Why has a cat a tail? Why is grass green?

***"How the Great Religions Began," by Joseph Gaer. Published by Robert M. McBride & Co. $3.00.**

"But not everyone can answer these questions correctly.

"As an asker of questions the Man of long, long ago was very, very good. But as an answerer of questions he was not so very exact."

Then the writer goes on to reproduce in conversational form the imaginary exchange of ideas between primitive individuals about the sun spirit, the moon spirit, and the spirits of a rapidly increasing number of personified objects, until man finds himself in a perfect maze of spirits most of whom need to be appeased.

The originator of each religion is introduced as a child experiencing what is common to any child. The little prince who became the Buddha, learns to shoot with bow and arrow. He and a cousin have a shooting match in which the cousin accidentally stuns a pigeon. The prince revives and frees the bird thus making his cousin angry, for he claimed it. But the prince argues that not he who kills a creature may claim it but he who saves it. A rather interesting quarrel, to be sure!

Prince Vardhamana, the founder of Jainism, as a boy is taught by the royal animal-trainer how to manage elephants. Once he uses his knowledge to good effect. An elephant runs wild through the gardens. The prince calmly takes hold of the elephant's trunk, as he had been taught, swings upon its back and drives the great beast into the stables where it is soon chained. For this bravery he receives a new name meaning Great Hero.

In the story of Confucianism we do not begin with Confucius but with his father "Shuh-liang Heih . . . a big man, over seven feet in height, and broad across the back like a quiet river. . . ."

Once, it is told, Shuh-lieng Heih was leading an army and besieged the fortress of an enemy of Tsow. The entrance of the fortress was left open, and many of Heih's men rushed into it. When they were inside, the enemy at once began to lower the gates to trap the soldiers of Tsow. Just then Suh-liang Heih the Valiant rushed up to the immense gates, raised them with his hands, and held them there until all his men passed through and escaped.

No boy has any difficulty developing an interest in the son of such a man. Some such method is used in the approach to each religion. But who would suppose Reincarnation, Karma, and Nirvana to be of much concern to a modern growing boy very much interested in football, basketball, and airplanes? Yet I found that these subjects were presented from the boy's point of view so effectively that when I read about them to my boy he understood and remembered what they meant. The chapters on Judaism and Christianity are no less attractively arranged, though perhaps the American child's greater familiarity with these subjects may affect slightly his interest in them.

The book helps to fill a deep-felt need in my parental life. I want my boys to know the leading facts about the various religions in spite of the fact that left to themselves they would probably think almost exclusively of airplanes. The time will come, no doubt, when piloting an airplane will be as commonplace as driving a car. But the person who grows up with an interest in the deep longings of the soul as experienced by people through the ages will be more than a mechanic. I would like my boys to be unprejudiced in religion, and one of the best means to that end is to have them know the good points of various religions. A person must be hopeless indeed who can make even a cursory study of comparative religion and think one of them contains all the truth. I wish my boys, in rejecting any religious ideas, to do so intelligently and not as so many people through mere ignorant indifference. I have become inexpressibly weary with the average religious instruction prepared for the majority of boys and girls. Therefore I welcome this book with its great theme of the Good Life. Maybe there will never be a Good Life universally accepted, free from the trappings and superstition found in all present religions, but if so it will take root first in the minds of young people who have grown up under the influence of such literature as this.

FRANK S. HARWOOD.

Correspondence

A Foreign Student Looks at Christianity

Editor of UNITY:

Our experience with students of various nationalities in our own home has given us an understanding of some of them, which I believe might be of interest to your readers. May I mention one in particular.

During the past summer we have had in our home a Chinese student of the finest type of intellectual and moral standards. He is a graduate of an American, Christian college in China, has a good knowledge of both the Old and New Testaments and had an unusually keen desire to learn the truth in every phase of life; yet he is not willing to accept Christianity as his religion.

We were soon much impressed with this young man's philosophy and high ideals and, of course, were somewhat surprised to learn that he did not accept Christianity. He, being an unusually modest man and of real refinement, did not wish to express any criticism of the American people or of our religion; however, as we became better acquainted we were able to discover that he had apparently good reasons for not accepting the teachings which he had been told were essential.

During the past fifty years the Chinese people have been able, in a small degree, to overcome the myths and legends which were handed down from generation to generation for ages and the leaders are beginning to search for the truth in every way.

We found that this man had been taught that what many people consider myths in the Apostles Creed were essential in becoming a Christian. It is not strange that our apparent myths would seem repulsive to him when his greatest hope was to overcome such beliefs.

Our Chinese friend had developed an extreme horror of opium and alcohol. One can imagine his disappointment when he found that alcoholic liquor was used in some of the Church sacraments in a country which is making a supreme effort to overcome the liquor traffic. To add to his disappointment in the ritual of the Church which he attended, he found that only communicants of that particular denomination were eligible to participate in the service in which the liquor was used.

We, of course, regretted that a man of such unusual refinement was not registering himself with the forces of Christianity as we believe that we need his help as well as he needs our cooperation. We have given much thought as to how we might be able to enlist him. We believe that we have made some progress, though we would not expect that one who had thought carefully and had well-formed ideas of the philosophy of life would change easily.

This young Chinese and thousands of others like him have heard all of the arguments that can be brought forward; therefore, it seems useless to try to win him to Christianity by arguing about our religion.

We, who have homes, have great opportunities to invite such foreign students to visit us. By living Christianity in our own homes we may be able gradually to

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

NINE NEEDIEST CASES

Everyone's heart is touched by the "Hundred Neediest Cases" for which the New York *Times* collects hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. The beneficiaries have become destitute through misfortune for which no one is directly responsible but for which no provision is made under our political system.

The following cases of injustice are the result of deliberate violation of the spirit of American liberty by our courts. The victims have suffered because they dared to strive for better working and living conditions in the richest country in the world. Contributions sent to *The Arbitrator* will be forwarded to the proper relief or defense committees.

Gastonia Strikers—Seven young men are out on bail pending an appeal from their conviction for murder. Five of them called at our office and made a very favorable impression. Three of them, sentenced to twelve to twenty years, did not fire a shot when the police officer was killed and one was not even present but was sentenced to five years. When their headquarters were first raided and destroyed by an armed mob they made no resistance. The mob was not prosecuted. Then the strikers made the mistake of arming themselves. They did so openly and sent a photograph of their arms to the Governor of North Carolina to convince the employers that resistance would be met if another attack were made. When the next attack was made the strikers did not fire, although one of them was blackjacked, but two hours later when another raid was made to break up their meetings on their lot, shots were exchanged and the chief of police was killed. It is not usually considered murder to defend oneself. Acts of violence have been perpetrated again and again by the employers, including the shooting of Ella May Wiggins, the massacre of six strikers at Marion, the flogging of Wells and others. In this class war those who were fighting for decent wages and hours were convicted by the courts, while those who were exploiting labor went free. On December 21 the eight deputy sheriffs, charged by the state of North Carolina with shooting strikers in the back, were acquitted. They had killed six strikers and wounded twenty more without suffering serious injury themselves.

Mooney and Billings—These men have been in San Quentin prison for twelve years on account of an explosion with which they were not connected by any true evidence. Ten years ago the investigation made and published by the Federal Government established beyond doubt that their conviction was due to a frame-up. The judge and jury who convicted them have admitted the error of the trial and have asked for a pardon, but the men are kept in jail because they were labor agitators. The Governor of California has referred the case to the Advisory Pardon Board.

Centralia I. W. W.—Eight men have been imprisoned for nearly ten years for defending the I. W. W. headquarters, as they had a legal right to do, against an attack by the American Legion. Many jurors in this case also have requested a pardon for the men convicted under compulsion of the war spirit. Funds are needed to pay $20 a month to the three families of the married prisoners.

Salvatore Accorsi—Held in prison from June to December for murdering a Pennsylvania State trooper some years ago, Accorsi was acquitted on December 13 for lack of evidence. It was well known that he had nothing to do with the crime, but he had been guilty of attending a meeting to express sympathy for Sacco and Vanzetti. The state that made the mistake pays him nothing for the false arrest, imprisonment, loss of work and legal expenses. Will you?

Ohio Communists—Johnson and

---

influence them to believe that there is really something in Christianity which is worth while.

My personal opinion is that we can not hope to influence them by giving them myths and legends similar to those with which they have been burdened for centuries.

Many of these young men have brilliant minds and are ready to grasp the teaching of a religion which is reasonable and will stand the test of fair minded thinking.

JAMES S. MORSE,
Cayuga County Council of Religious Education.
Levanna, N. Y.

Mr. Levinson's Second "Sanction"

Editor of UNITY:

I note your first editorial in the issue of January 20. All who believe in freedom must be opposed in principle to the "sanction" there requoted from S. O. Levinson. If freedom is to be our goal we cannot favor the suppression of any one's opinion, no matter who the person is or what the opinion is. Hence such a "sanction" should not be approved by any claiming to stand for freedom. If a right to suppress opinion is to be approved, then we have to fall back on the war-like right of might, that whoever has the most power at any particular time has the right to suppress all opposing expressions of opinion. If peace is to be genuine it cannot be based on the suppression of the opinions of folks who for a time continue to believe in war.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW.
Phoenix, Arizona.

Prices, Wages and Unemployment

Editor of UNITY:

The published statements of President Hoover's industrial conference almost without exception left out any emphasis or even comment on a very important requirement to make their program a success. Two newspapers, of a list of fourteen examined, without comment quoted Mr. Ford as saying that to maintain the purchasing power of the nation, "Increased prices of commodities should not be permitted to absorb increased wages."

A recent news item quoted a competitor of Mr. Ford as saying that "prices would have to be increased to maintain the dividends expected by the stockholders."

If the proposed industrial program pays out an extra billion of dollars, and prices of commodities are increased a like amount because of the "increased demand" thus created, will the unemployment problem be solved?

To serve their purpose, goods must be distributed as well as produced. If the laws of economics are to be suspended so far as the laborer and his employer is concerned, as indicated in their agreement to Mr. Hoover's suggestion, a like suspension of those laws pertaining to the selling (distribution) of goods must be enforced. Goods are secured by earning them, stealing them, or through charity. The only legitimate and adequate means by which goods may be secured is through the privilege of earning them and *the ability to collect the value earned.* As the law of supply and demand is applied to the undistributed goods and is interpreted alone by the group in possession without recognition of the property rights of those who contributed to their value, the demand for a billion dollars worth of goods will be the excuse to increase the price to those who have earned a share and try to collect it.

During the ten-year period of the war, prices of commodities increased 104.3 per cent, an average of more than 10 per cent each year. As the conservation program of the government and a normal increase in production (15 per cent in 12 basic products) kept the supply at normal, the excuse for high prices (with excess profits so excessive that the government confiscated a part) was the demand due to an increased export trade. The maximum exports for any one year of that period was $8,000,000,000 at the increased prices, or less than four billions at normal prices. As this was about $1,000,000,000 more than the average volume of exports it equals the estimated amount of wages that will be paid out under the stabilization program which is expected to give employment to a million of the new unemployed.

But, if 25,000,000 families each use a thousand dollars worth of goods a year, or a total of $25,000,000,000 worth, a 4 per cent increase in price of goods will give the billion dollars to the distributors, scatter the cost over the labor group, create a new group of unemployed and leave the whole problem unsolved.

CHAS. P. KRAFT.
Columbus, Ohio.

Gwynn have been sentenced to five to ten years and Lil Andrews has been sent to the reformatory for distributing literature attacking the government's foreign policy and advocating Communism. Perhaps no one should advocate Communism, but our foreign policy does need reforming. The Constitution has a clause about freedom of speech the exercise of which is often punished as contempt of court by our judges.

Chicago Sedition — Twenty-eight Communists are held on bail of $5,000 to $15,000 each for sedition, whatever that is. Seven of them have been framed up for robbery as the easiest way to gain a conviction.

Tapolschanyi—His citizenship papers were revoked when he was found to be a Communist, as if it were not legal to have any political convictions except those dictated by the two major parties. The case is being appealed.

California Red Flag—Five women have been sentenced to six months to five years for displaying a red flag and teaching children to salute it.

Bethlehem Sedition—Four workers are to be tried in connection with a May Day celebration.

So many of these people in distress are Communists that we must explain that we do not approve of the methods of that political party. But when individuals of any sort are imprisoned for acts they did not commit, or for altruistic endeavors to secure justice, they deserve assistance. Let everyone who did not lose in the stock market send in a thank offering. We will try to double your gifts if not too generous.

The Arbitrator.

THE LIQUOR SITUATION IN CANADA

Look at Canada. The drink bill in the Province of British Columbia in 1920, the last year of prohibition, was $909,884; in 1927-'28, under government sale, the figure was $13,956,909, an increase of 1433 per cent. What happened? The business failures under prohibition averaged 49 annually; under government sale, 139. The provincial debt in dry 1920 was $34,071,936; in wet 1924, $68,851,436; in wet 1928, $84,191,130, with, of course, steadily increasing taxation. Drunkenness likewise has increased appallingly —232.3 per cent from dry 1918 to wet 1928. Here are the figures for the provincial jail of British Columbia; in wet 1916, 3175 inmates; in dry 1917, 996; in dry 1918, 845; in dry 1919, 686; in wet 1925, 1514; in wet 1927, 1676; in wet 1928, 2047. What of insanity in British Columbia? In 1921 there were 1566 inmates in hospitals for mental diseases; in 1928 there were 2269 inmates. Accidents also have greatly increased in Canada under the government sale plan. In Vancouver in 1919 there were 2822 automobile accidents, while in 1928 there were 10,529, drinking being admittedly a heavy contributing cause to this dreadful increase. In Vancouver in dry 1919 there was spent for relief of poverty and for social work $52,185.83, and in dry 1920, $61,501.78, but in wet 1928 the sum reached $234,511.16.

—Zion's Herald.

Chateau de Bures
par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise
17 Miles from Paris, France
Country Boarding School
To Prepare Boys for American Colleges
30 Acres Own Farm
New Dormitories With Outdoor Sleeping Porches
Gymnasium. Athletic Fields
Modern, Progressive Methods
Music, Art, Sciences
English, French, and American Masters
For information address
Edwin Cornell Zavitz, Headmaster
Chateau de Bures, par Villennes, Seine-et-Oise, France

FEBRUARY
Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.
Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers
PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK ON INDIA

Strongly endorsed by Tagore, Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Mrs. Besant, Presidents of the Indian National Congress, Indian Leaders of All Parties, practically the Whole Periodical Press of India.

INDIA IN BONDAGE

Her Right to Freedom and a Place
Among the Great Nations
By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Pp. 556. 12 Illustrations. Price at Booksellers $4.00, by mail $4.10.
Lewis Copeland Co., Inc.
Publishers, 119 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y.

This book, just from the press in New York, was published a few months ago in India. The British Government, alarmed at its quick and great sale, suppressed it, and arrested its publishers. Practically all India answered by indignant protests. Mahatma Gandhi published an article in the book's defense, four columns in length.

No other word in our generation has been so universally acclaimed by the highest Indian authorities, as a true and just portrayal of India's civilization, life, and political conditions.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE the poet writes: "If Americans would know the true India, they cannot have a better guide than Dr. Sunderland. I regard his book as the best informed, most just and trustworthy that has come from any pen. A part of its high value is as an unanswerable reply to the misrepresentations in Miss Mayo's **Mother India.**"

MRS. ANNA BESANT writes: "Dr. Sunderland's powerful chapters should be read by everybody who would understand India."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says: "No other American is so widely known or so loved in India, as Dr. Sunderland, and this book gives eloquent testimony as to the reasons why."

THE PATRIKA, Calcutta's leading daily declares: "**India in Bondage** easily takes the first place among all the books on India in recent years."